

2 3

4 5

6 7

> 8 9

11

12

10

13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

//

I, Tim C. Hale, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney in good standing before the State Bar of California and am admitted to practice in this Court. I am a member of the law firm of Russo & Hale LLP, counsel for Defendants in this matter. I make the statements herein of my personal knowledge, except where stated on information and belief, which matters I believe to be true, and could and would competently testify to the same if called as a witness.
- 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of Verigy's responses to Defendants' Third Set of Interrogatories, in which Verigy refuses to answer six of the interrogatories on the basis that earlier interrogatories allegedly contained discrete subparts.
- 3. On Tuesday, September 10. 2008, the last day to bring a motion to compel, I sent two separate emails to counsel for Verigy, asking if Verigy would change its position regarding the subpart objections it had made and used to refuse to respond to the six interrogatories. As part of that communication, I informed Verigy's counsel that Verigy was taking an inconsistent position regarding the subparts objections it was making in response to Defendants' interrogatories in relation to the position it was taking as to its own responses. I was able to eventually speak with one of Verigy's attorneys, Colin McCarthy, about 4:15 p.m. I verbally explained the issues to Colin, which were the same issues I had set forth in my email, and Colin said he would look into the interrogatories where Verigy had made the subpart objection, but understood that Defendants needed to file their motion, since Verigy was not presently willing to concede the issue.
- 4. As noted above, Verigy has claimed that certain interrogatories propounded by Defendants contain discrete subparts, and must be counted as multiple interrogatories, while at the same time asserting in response to Defendants' interrogatory responses that far more compound interrogatories must be counted as single interrogatories. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of a letter from counsel for Verigy in which Verigy takes the position that certain of its interrogatories are not compound (see pages 12, 14), in contradiction to the position it has taken in order to avoid responding to six of Defendants' interrogatories.

Ca	se 5:07-cv-04330-RMW	Document 316-2	Filed 09/10/2008	Page 4 of 4
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
RUSSO & HALE LLP Palo Alto, California www.computerlaw.com sm	Opp. to Motion to Disclose	1	Case N	o. 5:07-cv-04330-RMW (HRL)